# TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Sections 200, 202, 203 and 355 of the Fish and Game Code, and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 208, 215, 220, 355 and 356 of said Code, proposes to amend Sections 300 and 600, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to seasons and bag limits for upland game birds.

#### **Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview**

1. Permit Ranges for Sage Grouse

Existing regulations [Section 300(a)(1)(D)(4)] allow 100 two-bird permits for the East Lassen Zone, 40 two-bird permits for the Central Lassen Zone, 10 one-bird permits for the North Mono Zone, and 25 one-bird permits for the South Mono and Inyo Zone. Under the current regulatory cycle, the Fish and Game Commission notice hearing date for sage grouse regulation changes occurs in May. However, the final sage grouse population survey results are not available until after the date that the Department must submit proposed regulation changes to the Commission. The Department is proposing a range of maximum and minimum hunting permit numbers to the Commission, with the provision that the actual number of permits recommended for each hunt will be based on strutting ground counts conducted in April.

The proposed ranges are 10 to 375 permits for the East Lassen Zone, 10 to 175 permits for the Central Lassen Zone, 10 to 100 permits for the North Mono Zone, and 10 to 100 permits for the South Mono and Inyo Zone. To allow the Department to recommend appropriate hunting permit quotas which reflect the results of population surveys, ranges of permit quotas are proposed at this preliminary stage of the regulation review process.

2. Change in Zone Boundary for South Mono and Inyo Sage Grouse Hunt Zone

The existing boundary for this zone [Section 300(a)(1)(D)(3)(d)] results in hunting being restricted to areas of lower sage grouse populations. The proposed zone changes would close areas with sparse sage grouse populations, and focus hunting where most sage grouse occur. Since a permit system is used, only a limited number of birds can be taken.

3. Increased Archery Season Length for Wild Turkeys

The existing archery spring hunting season for turkeys [Section 300(a)(2)(G)(1)(b)] opens on the last Saturday in March, extending for 37

days. Archery hunters have requested an additional two weeks following the end of the existing season, when only archery equipment could be used. The Department believes that this additional archery season would provide more hunting opportunity, yet would result in only a small number of additional gobblers being taken.

4. Amend Licensed Game Bird Club Regulations to Eliminate Outdated Reporting Information

Existing wording in Section 600(a)(7) (Shooting Records Maintenance) requires that forms showing daily and monthly numbers of each species of birds released and taken on Licensed Game Bird Clubs be sent to a specific address that is no longer appropriate. Proposed wording states that these records shall be sent to an address to be determined by the Department. Existing wording also includes a mailing address and telephone number for the License and Revenue Branch in Section 600(a)(1) (Application Form). Proposed wording deletes this information, which is unnecessary in regulatory language.

**NOTICE IS GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at Elk Valley Rancheria, 2500 Howland Hill Road, Crescent City, California on Thursday, June 24, 2004, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

**NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the Mono Memorial Hall, 100 Sinclair Street, Bridgeport, California on August 6, 2004, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before July 30, 2004, at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@dfg.ca.gov, but must be received no later than August 6, 2004 at the hearing in Bridgeport, CA. All written comments must include the true name and mailing address of the commentor.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Robert R. Treanor, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct inquiries to Robert R. Treanor or Tracy L. Reed at the preceding address or phone number. John Carlson, Jr., Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3555 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fg\_comm/.

### Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 202 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

# **Impact of Regulatory Action**

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulation change is sufficiently minor that there would be no significant economic impact to businesses.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California: None.
- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:
  - The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal funding to the State: None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

# Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business.

## Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective as and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Robert R. Treanor Executive Director

Dated: May 21, 2004